REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 9-10, 13-16, 19-21, and 23-45. Claims 1, 13, 19, 23, 25-28, 35, 37-39, and 41-45 have been amended. Claim 14 has been canceled. As a result, claims 1-4, 9-10, 13, 15-16, 19-21, and 23-45 are pending for examination with claims 1, 13, 19, 23, 28, 35, 38, 39, and 41 being independent claims. The amendments made find support in the specification, and do not constitute new matter.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejections

Claim 1

The Examiner has rejected independent Claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Pollack, U.S. Patent No. 6,505,236 (hereinafter Pollack). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant has amended Claim 1 to call for:

> "A method for servicing email at a client of a sender of an
> email comprising: receiving a request at the client of the
> sender to send the email; **determining at the client of the
> sender whether the email to be sent includes one or more
> attachments**; **determining** whether a recipient of the email
> has **distributed storage** separate from an incoming email
> server of the recipient for storing email attachments, if the
> email to be sent includes one or more attachments;
> determining a network address of the recipient's
> distributed storage for storing email attachments, if the

recipient has such distributed storage; determining whether the recipient's distributed storage is available to receive the one or more attachments upon determining the network address; if the recipient has distributed storage for storing email attachments and the distributed storage is available to accept said one or more attachments: **sending a main body of the email to the incoming email server of the recipient**; sending an instruction to the recipient's distributed storage to submit a request for the one or more attachments of the email; and upon receipt of such a request, sending the one or more attachments of the email to the recipient's distributed storage for email." (emphasis added)

As such, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Pollack under 35 U.S.C §102(e).

The specification provides for:

"A **sender email client**, in response to a request to send an email with attachment, **determines whether a recipient of the email has distributed storage separate from an incoming email server of the recipient** for storing email attachments." (page 4, lines 15-18) (emphasis added)

Pollack, on the other hand provides for:

"In accordance with this invention, network-based mail attachment storage systems 10, Fig. 1, **includes a receiving portal 12 for receiving an electronic mail item 14 from a sender 16.** The electronic mail item 14 includes a forwarding specification 18 and an attachment 20." (column 4, lines 3-7) (emphasis added)

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 09/915,096
Attorney Docket Number: 302375.02
Filing Date: 07/25/2001

Pollack also provides for:

> "... the network-based mail attachment storage system 10
> includes **an attachment stripper** 24 for detaching
> attachment 20 from the mail item 14..." (column 4, lines
> 26-29) (emphasis added)

Pollack does not disclose or anticipate several elements required in Claim 1. For example, Pollack does not disclose or anticipate the Claim 1 limitation of "if the email to be sent includes one or more attachments; determining a network address of the recipient's distributed storage for storing email attachments, if the recipient has such distributed storage; determining whether the recipient's distributed storage is available to receive the one or more attachments upon determining the network address; if the recipient has distributed storage for storing email attachments and the distributed storage is available to accept said one or more attachments: sending a main body of the email to the incoming email server of the recipient; sending an instruction to the recipient's distributed storage to submit a request for the one or more attachments of the email; and upon receipt of such a request, sending the one or more attachments of the email to the recipient's distributed storage for email."

The Office Action appears to equate "a receiving portal 12 for receiving an electronic mail item 14 from a sender 16" in Pollack (column 4, lines 4-6) with the client of the sender of the email separating the main body of the email from the attachments referenced in Claim 1. Pollack describes a receiving portal that is identified as being on the network and not on the client of the sender. Pollack describes an attachment stripper that detaches the attachment from the mail item after the receiving portal on the network receives the email with attachments from the client of the sender, as illustrated in Pollack FIG. 1. In contrast, the specification states that "if it is determined that the specified recipient being processed is endowed with such distributed storage,

and the distributed storage is currently accessible, email client 104 sends the main body of the email to the incoming email server of the specified recipient, and causes the attachment or attachments to be sent to distributed storage of the specified recipient for storage" (page 11, lines 4–9). The email is separated into the main body and attachment or attachments at the client of the sender of the email and the main body is sent to an incoming email server and the attachment or attachments are sent to a distributed storage. In Pollack, the separation of the main body of the email and the attachment or attachments is done by an "attachment stripper" at the receiving portal that is located on the network, not on the client of the sender of the email.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Pollack under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Claims 2–4, 9, and 10 are dependent on Claim 1. As such, Claims 2–4, 9, and 10 are believed allowable based upon Claim 1.

Claim 13

Applicant has amended Claim 13 to call for:

> "A method for servicing email at a server comprising:
> **receiving at the server an email on behalf of a recipient**,
> the email including a main body and one or more
> attachments; **determining whether the recipient of the
> email has distributed storage for storing email
> attachments by querying a recipient email distributed
> storage location server**; determining a network address of
> the recipient's distributed storage for storing email
> attachments, if the recipient has such distributed storage;

determining periodically whether the recipient's
distributed storage is available to receive the one or more
attachments upon determining the network address;
sending an instruction to the recipient's distributed
storage to submit a request for the one or more
attachments of the email; and upon such a request,
sending the one or more attachments of the email to the
recipient's distributed storage for email attachments."
(emphasis added)

As such, Applicant submits that Claim 13 is not anticipated by Pollack under 35

U.S.C. §102(e).

The specification provides for:

"For the illustrated embodiment, email client 104
determines whether a specified recipient being processed
is endowed with such distributed storage (including its
network address) **by querying a distributed storage
location server (such as distributed storage location server
124 of Fig. 1).** In one embodiment, if the specified
recipient is endowed with such distributed storage,
location server 124 returns the network address
automatically; otherwise location server 124 returns a null
value (or alternatively, an error code). In another
embodiment, location server 124 additionally returns an
attribute bit denoting whether the recipient's distributed
storage is currently available." (page 11, lines 14-22)
(emphasis added)

Pollack, on the other hand provides for:

"In order to eliminate this potential bandwidth bottleneck,
the network-based mail attachment storage system 10
includes an attachment stripper 24 for detaching

attachment 20 from mail item 14 , which generates stripped attachment 20 '. Storage device 26 stores stripped attachment 20 '. This storage device can be any typical storage device known to those skilled in the art, such as hard drives 28 , optical drives 30 , static or dynamic RAM 32 , tape drives 34 or RAID arrays 36 . Additionally, experimental storage devices, such as molecular and protein-based, can be utilized. Storage device 26 stores stripped attachment 20 ' under a specific filename 38 at a specific address 40 . The file naming/addressing scheme can be any of those commonly known in the art (e.g. hexadecimal addressing, filename and path specification, etc.)." (column 4, lines 25-39)

Pollack also provides for:

"Parser 41 processes forwarding specification 18 to extract the recipient address 19 of the intended recipient 22 . There are numerous ways in which recipient address 19 can be encoded within forwarding specification 18 , such as:
(I) forwarding specification 18 could simply be the forwarding address of electronic mail item 14 . For example, sender 16 could address mail item 14 to the network-based mail attachment storage system 10 (e.g. forward@thinmail.com) and include a forwarding address which is the address of recipient 22 in a header field (e.g. forward to: recipient@anycompany.com). In this case, parser 41 would determine the recipient address 19 to be the forwarding address (recipient@anycompany.com);
(II) electronic mail item 14 may contain only a single address (as opposed to the dual address scheme of (I)) where the recipient address 19 is encoded within the forwarding specification 18 . For example, sender 16 could address mail item 14 to "recipient%anycompany.com@thinmail.com", where parser 41 would extract anything to the left of the "@" sign and convert the "%" symbol to the "@" sign. This, in turn, would

result in the recipient address 19 being
"recipient@anycompany.com";

(III) since some mail systems use the "%" sign to route
email, it may be desirable not to use the "%" symbol. In this
case, any other symbol could be used. Sender 16 could
simply specify the symbol to be converted as the symbol
before the "@" sign. **For example, sender 16 could address
mail item 14 to "recipient$anycompany.
com$@thinmail.com", where parser 41 would extract
anything to the left of the "@" sign.** Parser 41 would then
look at the rightmost symbol "$" in the extracted address
and convert that symbol to an "@" sign. This would result
in the recipient address 19 being
"recipient@anycompany.com"; or

(IV) **alternatively, sender 16 could address mail item 14 to
a predefined address at the network-based mail
attachment storage system 10 (e.g. ibmlist 1
@thinmail.com).** Parser 41 will recognize this embedded
address (ibmlist 1) and associate it with a user defined
distribution list of recipient addresses. This allows stored
attachment 20 ' to be distributed to several recipients
simultaneously." (column 4, lines 39-67, and column 5,
lines 1-16) (emphasis added)

Pollack does not disclose or anticipate several elements required in Claim 13.

For example, Pollack does not disclose or anticipate the Claim 13 limitation of

"determining whether the recipient of the email has distributed storage for storing email

attachments **by querying a recipient email distributed storage location server.**" The

Office Action cites Pollack, column 4, lines 25-39, as describing the above limitation of

Claim 13, but this excerpt, and the remainder of Pollack, makes no mention of a

"location server" or of "querying" a location server. Rather, Pollack describes an

attachment stripper and a parser process that remove the attachments from the email

and to determine where to send the main body of the email. Pollack implicitly requires

the sender of the email to: 1) know that the recipient has a network-based storage, 2)

send the email to the appropriate location, and 3) modify the email appropriately, as described above, so that the parser process can extract the forwarding email address to send the main body of the email after the one or more attachments are removed. In contrast, for example, the specification provides for a location server that "in response to a request to register a user's email attachment distributed storage, registers the distributed storage's network address," and "provides a requestor with the registrant's distributed storage's network address, when requested" (page 4, lines 21-24). Such a location server is manifestly different from the description of Pollack, which makes no mention of such an "email distributed storage location server."

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 13 is not anticipated by Pollack under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Claims 15 and 16 are dependent on Claim 13. As such, Claims 15 and 16 are believed allowable based upon Claim 13.

<u>35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections</u>

The Examiner has rejected independent Claims 19, 23, 28, 35, 38, 39, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pollack, U.S. Patent No. 6,505,236, further in view of Hazan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,434,602 (hereinafter Hazan). The Examiner has acknowledged for Claims 19-21 and 23-45 that "Pollack fails to teach the limitation of further including the user being a part of a peer-to-peer communication system" (Office Action mailed 05/23/2006, pages 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, and 17).

Claim 19

Applicant has amended Claim 19 to call for:

> "A method **for an email distributed storage location server**, comprising: receiving a registration to register an email user's distributed storage for email attachments, said user being a part of **a peer-to-peer communication system**; storing a network address of the email user's distributed storage for email attachments; receiving a request from a requestor for the network address of the email user's distributed storage for email attachments; and providing the requestor with the network address of the email user's distributed storage for email attachments." (emphasis added)

As such, Applicant submits that Claim 19 is not unpatentable over Pollack, further in view of Hazan, under U.S.C. §103(a).

The specification provides for:

> "For the illustrated embodiment, email client 104 determines whether a specified recipient being processed is endowed with such distributed storage (including its network address) **by querying a distributed storage location server (such as distributed storage location server 124 of Fig. 1).** In one embodiment, if the specified recipient is endowed with such distributed storage, location server 124 returns the network address automatically; otherwise location server 124 returns a null value (or alternatively, an error code). In another embodiment, location server 124 additionally returns an attribute bit denoting whether the recipient's distributed storage is currently available." (page 11, lines 14-22) (emphasis added)

The specification further provides for:

> "Figures 4a-4b illustrate the operational flow of the relevant aspects of **location server 124,** in accordance with one embodiment. As illustrated in Fig. 4a, **in response to a registration request of a new service subscriber, block 402, location server 404 registers the subscriber user, and stores the network address of the subscriber user's distributed storage for storing email attachments.** In one embodiment, the network address of the distributed storage of the **subscriber user** is provided to location server 124 as part of the **registration process**, if the distributed storage has a statically assigned network address." (page 13, lines 18-25) (emphasis added)

Pollack, on the other hand provides for:

> "In order to eliminate this potential bandwidth bottleneck, the network-based mail attachment storage system 10

includes an attachment stripper 24 for detaching attachment 20 from mail item 14 , which generates stripped attachment 20 '. Storage device 26 stores stripped attachment 20 '. This storage device can be any typical storage device known to those skilled in the art, such as hard drives 28 , optical drives 30 , static or dynamic RAM 32 , tape drives 34 or RAID arrays 36 . Additionally, experimental storage devices, such as molecular and protein-based, can be utilized. Storage device 26 stores stripped attachment 20 ' under a specific filename 38 at a specific address 40 . The file naming/addressing scheme can be any of those commonly known in the art (e.g. hexadecimal addressing, filename and path specification, etc.).

Parser 41 processes forwarding specification 18 to extract the recipient address 19 of the intended recipient 22 . There are numerous ways in which recipient address 19 can be encoded within forwarding specification 18 , such as:

(I) forwarding specification 18 could simply be the forwarding address of electronic mail item 14 . For example, sender 16 could address mail item 14 to the network-based mail attachment storage system 10 (e.g. forward@thinmail.com) and include a forwarding address which is the address of recipient 22 in a header field (e.g. forward to: recipient@anycompany.com). In this case, parser 41 would determine the recipient address 19 to be the forwarding address (recipient@anycompany.com);

(II) electronic mail item 14 may contain only a single address (as opposed to the dual address scheme of (I)) where the recipient address 19 is encoded within the forwarding specification 18 . For example, sender 16 could address mail item 14 to "recipient%anycompany.com@thinmail.com", where parser 41 would extract anything to the left of the "@" sign and convert the "%" symbol to the "@" sign. This, in turn, would result in the recipient address 19 being "recipient@anycompany.com";

(III) since some mail systems use the "%" sign to route
email, it may be desirable not to use the "%" symbol. In this
case, any other symbol could be used. Sender 16 could
simply specify the symbol to be converted as the symbol
before the "@" sign. For example, sender 16 could address
mail item 14 to "recipient$anycompany.
com$@thinmail.com", where parser 41 would extract
anything to the left of the "@" sign. Parser 41 would then
look at the rightmost symbol "$" in the extracted address
and convert that symbol to an "@" sign. This would result
in the recipient address 19 being
"recipient@anycompany.com"; or
(IV) alternatively, sender 16 could address mail item 14 to
a predefined address at the network-based mail
attachment storage system 10 (e.g. ibmlist 1
@thinmail.com). Parser 41 will recognize this embedded
address (ibmlist 1) and associate it with a user defined
distribution list of recipient addresses. This allows stored
attachment 20 ' to be distributed to several recipients
simultaneously." (column 4 lines 25-67, column 5 lines 1-
16)

Pollack does not disclose or anticipate several elements required in Claim 19.

For example, Pollack does not disclose or anticipate the Claim 19 limitation of "A

method **for an email distributed storage location server**, comprising: **receiving** a

registration to **register** an email user's distributed storage for email attachments, said

user being a part of a peer-to-peer communication system." The Office Action cites

Pollack, column 4, lines 25-39 as describing the above limitation of Claim 19, but this

excerpt makes no mention of a "location server" or of "registration to register an email

user's distributed storage for email attachments." Pollack describes an attachment

stripper and a parser process that determines where to send the main body of the email.

Pollack implicitly requires the sender of the email to: 1) know that the recipient has a

distributed storage, 2) send the email to the appropriate location, and 3) modify the email appropriately, as described above, so that the parser process can extract the forwarding email address to send the main body of the email after the one or more attachments are removed. Pollack does not mention "registration" or "register" in his patent. Pollack also does not provide any registration process to register a user for distributed email storage.

Hazan provides for:

> "Various well known electronic mail systems exist today. For example, an electronic mail system may be implemented on a peer-to-peer network, a client/server architecture, a mainframe computer, on a dial-up service, such as Compuserve, AOL, Microsoft MSN, etc. Various methods for retrieving e-mail stored in a user's email account are also well known." (column 1, lines 11-18)

Hazan also provides for:

> "One preferred embodiment of the invention allows the user to **retrieve his/her e-mail messages via the Internet using a mail server address directly**, thereby eliminating the need for the user to separately log onto the electronic mail system associated with the user's e-mail account. The user can retrieve hie e-mail using **an Internet Kiosk**. The Kiosk houses a communication facility that connects to the Internet, a computer and a camera. **The Kiosk may be established at a convenient location, such as a restaurant, airport terminal, hotel, bank, shopping center, etc. The present invention operates in one of two ways: 1) when the program tries to determine the correct mail**

server address and 2) when a user knows his email server
address." (column 1, lines 45-59) (emphasis added)

The Office Action acknowledges "Pollack fails to teach the limitation further
including the user being a part of a peer-to-peer communication system. However,
Hazan teaches a method, apparatus, and article of manufacture for accessing electronic
messages (see abstract). Hazan teaches the use of a peer-to-peer network for e-mail
(col. 1, lines 11-18)" (Office Action mailed 05/23/2006, page 7).

Hazan does not disclose or anticipate several elements required in Claim 19. For
example, Hazan does not disclose or anticipate the Claim 19 limitation of "A method **for
an email distributed storage location server**, comprising: receiving a **registration** to
register an email user's **distributed storage** for email attachments, said user being a part
of a peer-to-peer communication system." Hazan does not mention a "location server"
in his patent. Hazan also does not mention "receiving a registration to register an email
user's distributed storage for email attachments." Further, Hazan does not mention
"registration" or "register" in his patent. Hazan also does not mention "distributed
storage" in his patent.

As such, Applicant submits that Claim 19 is not unpatentable over Pollack,
further in view of Hazan, under U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 20 and 21 are dependent on Claim 19. As such, Claims 20 and 21 are
believed allowable based upon Claim 19.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 09/915,096
Attorney Docket Number: 302375.02
Filing Date: 07/25/2001

Claim 23

Applicant has amended Claim 23 to call for:

"A method for **servicing email at a client of a recipient of an email** comprising: receiving at the client of the recipient of the email a request from a user **in a peer-to-peer communication system** to access an attachment of an email; determining whether a distributed storage for storing email attachments for the user is accessible and, if so, whether the attachment is stored in said distributed storage; and **retrieving the attachment from the distributed storage if the attachment is stored by the distributed storage and retrieving the attachment from an incoming email server if the attachment is not stored by the distributed storage.**" (emphasis added)

The specification provides for:

"Continuing to refer to Fig. 2, over at the **recipient side,** eventually, recipient 112 uses **email client 114 to open a received email to view the email, block 212.** Assuming the email has one or more attachments, eventually, recipient 112 opens or otherwise accesses the attachment (e.g. to save or otherwise extract the attachment from received email), block 214. In response, **email client 114 first accesses its distributed storage to attempt to retrieve the attachment. If the attempt is unsuccessful, i.e. the attachment of interest is not in the distributed storage (this corresponds to the case where the attachment could not be deposited into distributed storage by email client 104), email client 114 retrieves the attachment from its incoming email server.**" (page 12, lines 16-25) (emphasis added)

Pollack, on the other hand, provides for:

> "Network-based mail attachment storage system 10
> includes attachment retriever 50 which enables recipient
> 22 to retrieve stored attachment 20 ' from storage device
> 26 . Recipient 22 , having received appended electronic
> mail item 14 ', uses handle 44 in conjunction with
> attachment retriever 50 to access stored attachment 20 '.
> Typically, attachment retriever 50 will be resident on a
> network (or web) server or a series of servers and recipient
> 22 will access attachment retriever 50 via a web browser
> or any other proprietary program, HTML enabled e-mail
> reader or web browser plug in. Attachment retriever 50 ,
> upon receiving a request from recipient 22 to download
> stored attachment 20 ', analyzes handle 44 to determine
> the address 40 and filename 38 of stored attachment 20 '
> so that it can be downloaded by recipient 22 .
> Alternatively, attachment 20 ' can be previewed,
> translated, or downloaded in a streaming format to
> recipient 22." (column 5, lines 51-67)

Pollack does not disclose or anticipate several elements required by Claim 23. For example, Pollack does not disclose or anticipate the Claim 23 limitation of "determining whether a distributed storage for storing email attachments for the user is accessible and, if so, whether the attachment is stored in said distributed storage; and retrieving the attachment from the distributed storage if the attachment is stored by the distributed storage and retrieving the attachment from an incoming email server if the attachment is not stored by the distributed storage." Pollack does not provide any description of a way to access attachments on an "incoming email server" if the "distributed storage" does not have the attachment stored.

Further, similar to the above arguments, Hazan does not disclose or anticipate the same limitation of Claim 23. The disclosure of Hazan does not mention "distributed storage."

As such, Applicant submits that Claim 23 is not unpatentable over Pollack, further in view of Hazan, under U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 24-27 are dependent on Claim 23. As such, Claims 24-27 are believed allowable based upon Claim 23.

Claim 28

Applicant has amended Claim 28 to call for:

> "An apparatus comprising: a storage medium having
> stored therein a plurality of executable programming
> instructions that, when executed, perform the following
> steps for servicing email at **a client of a sender of an email**:
> receiving a request to send an email to a recipient in a
> peer-to-peer communication system; determining whether
> the email to be sent includes one or more attachments;
> determining whether the recipient of the email has
> distributed storage separate from an incoming email
> server of the recipient for storing email attachments **by
> querying a recipient email distributed storage location
> server,** if the email to be sent includes one or more
> attachments..." (emphasis added)

As such, Applicant submits that Claim 28 is not unpatentable over Pollack, further in view of Hazan, under U.S.C. §103(a) according to the arguments already provided above for Claim 13. Claim 28 and Claim 13 are different, but both contain

limitations related to an "email distributed storage location server," which, per the previously discussed arguments, is not disclosed or anticipated by Pollack. Furthermore, the addition of Hazan does not remedy the deficiency of Pollack with respect to this limitation.

Claims 29-34 are dependent on Claim 28. As such, Claims 29-34 are believed allowable based upon Claim 28.

Claim 35

Applicant has amended Claim 35 to call for:

> "An apparatus comprising: a storage medium having
> stored therein a plurality of executable programming
> instructions that, when executed, perform the following
> **steps for servicing email at a client in a peer-to-peer
> communication system**: receiving **at the client** an email on
> behalf of a recipient, the email including a main body and
> one or more attachments; determining whether the
> recipient of the email has distributed storage for storing
> email attachments **by querying a recipient email
> distributed storage location server**; determining a network
> address of the recipient's distributed storage for storing
> email attachments, if the recipient has such distributed
> storage ..." (emphasis added)

As such, Applicant submits that Claim 35 is not unpatentable over Pollack, further in view of Hazan, under U.S.C. §103(a) according to the arguments already provided above for Claim 13. Claim 35 and Claim 13 are different, but both contain limitations related to an "email distributed storage location server," which, per the previously discussed arguments, is not disclosed or anticipated by Pollack. Furthermore,

the addition of Hazan does not remedy the deficiency of Pollack with respect to this limitation.

Claims 36, 37 are dependent on Claim 35. As such, Claims 36, 37 are believed allowable based upon Claim 35.

Claim 38

Applicant has amended Claim 38 to call for:

> "An apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of executable programming instructions that, when executed, perform the following steps **for providing an email distributed storage location server capability at a client** in a peer-to-peer communication system: receiving a registration to register an email user's distributed storage for email attachments; storing a network address of the email user's distributed storage for email attachments; receiving a request from a requestor for the network address of the email user's distributed storage for email attachments; and providing the requestor with the network address of the email user's distributed storage for email attachments; and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the programming instructions. " (emphasis added)

As such, Applicant submits that Claim 38 is not unpatentable over Pollack, further in view of Hazan, under U.S.C. §103(a) according to the arguments already provided above for Claim 19. Claim 38 and Claim 19 are different, but both contain limitations related to registering an "email user's distributed storage for email

attachments," which, per the previously discussed arguments, is not taught or suggested by the combination of Pollack and Hazan.

Claim 39

Applicant has amended Claim 39 to call for:

> "An apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of executable programming instructions that, when executed, perform the following steps **for servicing email at a distributed storage location** in a peer-to-peer communication system: receiving a request from a selected one of a sender and an incoming email server of a user to pull an attachment of an email; submitting, in response, a request to the selected one of the sender and the incoming email server of the user to pull said email attachment; receiving said email attachment; and storing said email attachment; and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the programming instructions." (emphasis added)

Pollack, on the other hand, provides for:

> "In order to eliminate this potential bandwidth bottleneck, the network-based mail attachment storage system 10 includes an attachment stripper 24 for detaching attachment 20 from mail item 14 , which generates stripped attachment 20 '. Storage device 26 stores stripped attachment 20 '. This storage device can be any typical storage device known to those skilled in the art, such as hard drives 28 , optical drives 30 , static or dynamic RAM 32 , tape drives 34 or RAID arrays 36 . Additionally, experimental storage devices, such as molecular and protein-based, can be utilized. Storage

device 26 stores stripped attachment 20 ' under a specific
filename 38 at a specific address 40 . The file
naming/addressing scheme can be any of those commonly
known in the art (e.g. hexadecimal addressing, filename
and path specification, etc.)." (column 4, lines 25–39)

Pollack does not disclose or anticipate, as stated in Claim 39, performing "the
following steps for servicing email at a distributed storage location in a peer-to-peer
communication system: receiving a request from a selected one of a sender and an
incoming email server of a user to pull an attachment of an email; submitting, in
response, a request to the selected one of the sender and the incoming email server of
the user to pull said email attachment; receiving said email attachment; and storing said
email attachment." Pollack does not describe a "distributed storage location" that is able
to submit, in response to a request to pull an attachment of an email, "a request to the
selected one of the sender and the incoming email server of the user to pull said email
attachment." Pollack describes a storage mechanism that only receives the attachment.
Pollack does not describe any kind of storage mechanism that can request an
attachment from the client of the sender of the attachment.

Furthermore, the addition of Hazan does not remedy this deficiency of Pollack,
as Hazan does not contain any discussion of "distributed storage."

As such, Applicant submits that Claim 39 is not unpatentable over Pollack,
further in view of Hazan, under U.S.C. §103(a).

Claim 40 is dependent on Claim 39. As such, Claim 40 is believed allowable
based upon Claim 40.

Claim 41

Applicant has amended Claim 41 to call for:

> "An apparatus comprising: a storage medium having
> stored therein a plurality of executable programming
> instructions that, when executed, perform the following
> steps **for servicing email at a client of a recipient of an
> email** in a peer-to-peer communication system: receiving
> a request from a user to access an attachment of an email;
> determining whether a distributed storage for storing
> email attachments for the user is accessible; determining
> whether the attachment is stored in said distributed
> storage if said distributed storage is accessible; and
> servicing said request to access said attachment of said
> email **at said distributed storage or at an incoming email
> server**; and a processor coupled to the storage medium to
> execute the programming instructions." (emphasis added)

As such, Applicant submits that Claim 41 is not unpatentable over Pollack,
further in view of Hazan, under U.S.C. §103(a) according to the arguments already
provided above for Claim 23. Claim 41 and Claim 23 are different, but both contain
limitations related to "distributed storage" and an "incoming email server," which, per
the previously discussed arguments, are not taught or suggested by the combination of
Pollack and Hazan.

Claims 42-45 are dependent on Claim 41. As such, Claims 42-45 are believed
allowable based upon Claim 41.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's agent at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: <u>August 23, 2006</u>   By: _Andrew D. Enfield_

Andrew D. Enfield, Reg. No.: 57,651
Agent for Applicant
Direct telephone (425) 703-8227
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

James R. Banowsky, Reg. No 37,773

<u>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION</u>
<u>(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING</u>

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

<u>August 23, 2006</u>
Date

Signature

<u>Noemi Tovar</u>
Printed Name

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 09/915,096
Attorney Docket Number: 302375.02
Filing Date: 07/25/2001